Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 6-26 are pending in the application, with claims 9, 14, 15, 16, 21 and 26 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 3-5 have been cancelled previously without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. Claims 9, 14, 15, 21 and 26 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 2 and 6-26 under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,182,113 to Narayanaswami

(hereinafter Narayanaswami) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,839 to King et al.

(hereinafter King). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse this

rejection.

Independent claim 9, as amended, recites:

> 9. A computer program product comprising a
> computer useable medium including control logic stored
> therein, said control logic enabling a user to operate with
> channels for mobile devices, said control logic comprising:
> creating means for enabling a processor,
> responsive to user input, to create a bookmark to a first
> Web page;
> surfing means for enabling a processor,
> responsive to user input, to surf to a second Web page;
> invoking means for enabling a processor,
> responsive to user input, to invoke said bookmark, thereby
> navigating to said first Web page;
> generating means for enabling a processor
> to generate an automatic channel form pre-populated with
> at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having
> been determined via interaction with a browser, said
> generating means invoked by said first web page; and
> submitting means for enabling a processor,
> responsive to user input, to submit said automatic channel
> form to establish said second Web page as a channel.

Narayanaswami fails to teach each and every aspect of the amended independent

claim 9. On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that "Narayanaswami

does not explicitly teach of generating means for enabling a processor to generate an

automatic channel form pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said

URL having been determined via interaction with a browser". Furthermore,

Narayanaswami fails to teach or suggest "generating means for enabling a processor to

generate an automatic channel form pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having been determined *via interaction with a browser, said generating means invoked by said first web page*," as recited in independent claim 9 (emphasis added).

King fails to correct the deficiencies of Narayanaswami. King is directed towards inline variable management in a hypermedia display language. King uses "Activities" to determine variable scope where "An activity is a set of HDML cards with an associated set of variables" (see col. 10, lines 55-59). King also discusses the use of a navigational history stack to help the user navigate. "As each new piece of content is displayed, its URL is pushed on the navigational history stack. This allows the user to easily go backwards through the content he or she has viewed simply by popping URLs off the navigational history stack." (see King, col. 11, lines 57-63). King fails to teach or suggest "generating means for enabling a processor to generate an automatic channel form pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having been determined *via interaction with a browser, said generating means invoked by said first web page*" as recited in independent claim 9 (emphasis added).

Since Narayanaswami and King alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 9, they cannot render that claim obvious. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

For at least similar reasons as presented above with respect to claim 9, and further in view of their own respective features, independent claims 14-16, 21 and 26 are also patentable over Narayanaswami and King.

For example, independent claim 14 includes *inter alia* "reviewing an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second object/resource, said URL having been determined *via interaction with a browser, said automatic channel form generated by said first object/resource*" and independent claim 16 includes "reviewing an automatic channel form created in response to step(2) that is pre-populated with at least a URL of said web page, said URL having been determined *via interaction with a browser*" which is neither taught nor suggested by Narayanaswami or King.

Furthermore, claims 10-13, which depend from independent claim 9, claims 17-20, which depend from independent claim 16, claims 22-25 which depend from independent claim 21 and claims 2 and 6-8 which depend from independent claim 26 are also patentable over Narayanaswami and King for at least the same reasons described above and further in view of their own respective features. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Jeffrey S. Weaver
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 45,608

Date: _6-28-05_

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

383373_1.DOC